

Assessing the variety and pricing of selected foods in socioeconomically disparate districts of Berlin, Germany

Stroebele, Nanette; Dietze, Pia; Tinnemann, Peter; Willich, Stefan N.

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Stroebele, N., Dietze, P., Tinnemann, P., & Willich, S. N. (2010). Assessing the variety and pricing of selected foods in socioeconomically disparate districts of Berlin, Germany. *Journal of Public Health*, 19(1), 23-28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-010-0357-3>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Editorial Manager(tm) for Journal of Public Health
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: JOPH-D-10-00023R1

Title: Assessing variety and pricing of selected foods in socioeconomic disparate districts of Berlin, Germany

Article Type: Original Article

Corresponding Author: Dr. Nanette Stroebele, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Charité University Medical Centre, Berlin, Germany

First Author: Nanette Stroebele, PhD

Order of Authors: Nanette Stroebele, PhD; Pia Dietze; Peter Tinnemann, Dr. med.; Stefan N Willich, Prof

Abstract: **Aim:** The neighbourhood environment appears to influence people's food consumption. Access, variety and pricing of foods play a role in the socioeconomic difference of fruit and vegetable consumption. This study compared differences in number of grocery stores, variety of fresh fruits and vegetables and food prices in districts with different Social Index (SI) in Berlin, Germany. **Methods:** The district with the lowest SIs was compared to the district with the highest SI. The number of grocery stores offering fresh produce, the variety of fresh fruits and vegetables, and prices of selected healthy and less healthy food items were assessed and compared. **Results:** The low SI district had more grocery stores per residents than the high SI district. Variety and prices of fruits and vegetables did not differ between the two districts but milk and whole wheat bread were less expensive in the high SI district. For all grocery stores, selected foods with higher energy density had lower energy costs than low energy density foods. **Conclusion:** Health inequalities in Germany might be less influenced by access to healthy foods than in other countries but nutrient rich foods such as fruits and vegetables have higher energy costs than high energy dense foods.

Response to Reviewers: Response to reviewer's comments:

The authors provide no explanation why cigarettes are included in the study, which deals with pricing of food. Cigarettes don't belong to any group of food, so it has to be explained why they are analysed in this context as well.

- The authors have decided to exclude the item "cigarettes" from the analysis and the manuscript. The authors agree with the reviewer that the topic of cigarette pricing and its relationship to socioeconomic differences does not belong in this manuscript.

p. 2, 1st paragraph: ". behaviour. ", should use similar terms as in the rest of the text.

- The British orthography was used and all words were changed accordingly.

p. 5, 1st paragraph: The two areas Kreuzberg and Steglitz-Lankwitz are compared, but the population density is given for the three areas: Kreuzberg, Steglitz and Lankwitz. This is confusing and should be clarified.

- Official data only provides population density separately for Steglitz and Lankwitz but the authors hopefully clarified this confusion by calculating the mean for both areas.

p. 5, 1st paragraph and p. 9, 3rd paragraph: information about the size of the two areas is inconsistent: p.5 ". roughly the same size. ", p. 9 ". size. differed."

- The information regarding the size of the areas chosen was clarified.

p. 5, 3rd paragraph: It should be explained in this paragraph why the variety of food items was determined only in non-organic food stores (compare p.6, 1st paragraph).

- A sentence explaining the reasons for choosing only non-organic food stores was added (p. 5, 3rd paragraph)

p. 6, 1st paragraph: Which established criteria for the popularity for the chosen food products in the German population were used?

- A reference was added.

p. 7, 1st paragraph: ". framers' markets. ", should use similar terms as of the rest of the text.

- For all markets, the expression "farmers' markets" was chosen.

p. 8, 2nd paragraph: The relationship between energy density and energy costs should be explained shortly in the part "results", only referring to the figure would not be sufficient.

- The results presented in figure 1 were explained in more details (p. 8, 2nd paragraph).

p. 9, last paragraph and p. 11, 1st paragraph are identical.

- The last paragraph on page 9 was taken out.

Assessing variety and pricing of selected foods in socioeconomic disparate districts of Berlin, Germany.

Stroebele N, Dietze P, Tinnemann P, Willich SN.

Institute for Social Medicine, Epidemiology and Health Economy

Charité University Medical Centre, Berlin, Germany

Corresponding Author

Nanette Stroebele

Institute for Social Medicine, Epidemiology and Health Economy

Charité University Medical Centre

Luisenstr. 57

D- 10117 Berlin, Germany

Fax: +49 30 450 529902

Phone : +49 30 450 529125

Email: Nanette.Stroebele@charite.de

RUNNING HEAD: Environment, Food Variety and Pricing

1
2
3
4 **Abstract**
5
6
7
8

9 **Aim:** The neighbourhood environment appears to influence people’s food consumption. Access,
10 variety and pricing of foods play a role in the socioeconomic difference of fruit and vegetable
11 consumption. This study compared differences in number of grocery stores, variety of fresh
12 fruits and vegetables and food prices in districts with different Social Index (SI) in Berlin,
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Germany.

20
21 **Methods:** The district with the lowest SIs was compared to the district with the highest SI. The
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 number of grocery stores offering fresh produce, the variety of fresh fruits and vegetables, and
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 prices of selected healthy and less healthy food items were assessed and compared.

38
39 **Results:** The low SI district had more grocery stores per residents than the high SI district.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Keywords: environment, fruit and vegetables, pricing, accessibility, variety

1
2
3
4 **Introduction**
5

6 Unhealthy dietary behaviour, in particular the consumption of fruits and vegetables has been
7 shown to be particularly low among socioeconomically disadvantaged populations (Giskes et al.
8 2002; Hulshof et al. 2003). A systematic review revealed that household income appears to be
9 consistently positively related to fruit and vegetable intake (Kamphuis et al. 2006) and lower
10 socioeconomic groups seem to be less likely to follow existing dietary guidelines (Turrell et al.
11 2002).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Another factor that has been gaining attention recently is the possible influence of
22 neighbourhood food environment. Recent studies from the U.S. suggest that residents of
23 socioeconomically disadvantaged neighbourhoods have less access to affordable healthy food
24 choices compared to high socioeconomic neighbourhoods (Jetter et al. 2006; Hendrickson et al.
25 2006; Chung et al. 1999; Moore et al. 2006; Powell et al. 2007; Zenk et al. 2009). Healthier food
26 choices in deprived areas differ in their availability, variety and in price compared to healthier
27 choices in less deprived areas. In deprived areas fewer variety of fresh fruits and vegetables is
28 offered and fresh produce tend to be more expensive (Hosler et al. 2008; Zenk et al. 2005).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 However, other studies show few or no differences in food prices, availability or access between
42 deprived and affluent areas (Cassady et al. 2007; Smith et al. 2009; Winkler et al. 2006a;
43 Winkler et al. 2006b). Two recent systematic reviews examining the empirical evidence found
44 only little evidence for the influence of environmental factors on fruit and vegetable
45 consumption (Giskes et al. 2007; Kamphuis et al. 2007).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

66 Another aspect of the food environment has been gaining attention in the public health sector;
67 high energy dense foods, high fat foods and general convenience, processed foods including fast
68

1
2
3
4 food tend to be cheaper than healthy foods such as fresh fruits or vegetables (Drewnowski et al.
5
6 2004; Darmon et al. 2004). Research on dietary behaviour and social inequalities suggest that
7
8 low income households rather purchase energy dense foods that are nutrient poorer but are at an
9
10 affordable cost compared to more expensive nutrient rich foods such as fresh fruits and
11
12 vegetables (Drewnowski et al. 2005; Drewnowski 2009). Data from the U.S. shows an inverse
13
14 relationship between the energy density of foods and the energy costs measured in
15
16 USD/1000kcal (Drewnowski et al. 2005). It is possible that lower food costs might be associated
17
18 with higher energy dense diets which might lead to an increase in total energy intake. As a
19
20 consequence, the higher prevalence of overweight and obesity in socio-economically
21
22 disadvantaged groups could be explained by this imbalance of economics of food choice.
23
24
25
26
27

28 Research in the area of food environment and social inequality in Germany is lacking.

29
30 Although socioeconomic inequalities is less pronounced in Germany compared to other countries
31
32 (van Doorslaer et al. 2004; Hernandez-Quevedo et al. 2006), prior research has shown that
33
34 people of low economic standing in Germany have above average rates of malnutrition, eating
35
36 disorders and obesity (Mackenbach et al. 2008; Robert Koch-Institut 2006). The capital city of
37
38 Germany, Berlin, consists of a number of districts where inhabitants live under conditions
39
40 differing widely by their socioeconomic situation such as income, unemployment rate, and ethnic
41
42 background as well as in their health and disease status (Senatsverwaltung für Gesundheit 2009).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 In this pilot study, we sought to determine if differences in the food neighbourhood environment
51
52 are apparent in Berlin, Germany. We analyzed the two districts with the largest social economic
53
54 disparity and studied their availability of stores, produce prices and fruit and vegetable variety.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Methods**
5

6
7 This study investigated access to food within two districts in Berlin comparing the districts with
8
9 the lowest and highest socioeconomic population. The study examined (1) the number of grocery
10
11 stores offering fresh produce; (2) the variety of fresh fruits and vegetables available to the
12
13 consumers; and (3) the prices of a series of food items defined as healthy and unhealthy. Healthy
14
15 food items included a series of popular fresh fruits and vegetables, milk and whole-wheat bread.
16
17 As unhealthy, energy dense food items, such as frozen pizza, chocolate, and potato chips were
18
19 chosen.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Setting*
27

28
29 Two areas in Berlin similar in size but with a widely different socioeconomic population were
30
31 selected. The socioeconomic difference between the two areas was determined by a complex
32
33 measuring tool called the Social Index (SI) created by the city of Berlin (Senatsverwaltung für
34
35 Gesundheit 2009). The SI was developed to determine social differences between Berlin's
36
37 neighbourhoods and to create a common ground for analysis and planning of social communities.
38
39 Among other things, the index is based on unemployment rates, average per capita income,
40
41 number of people on social welfare, and life span expectancy. We chose to study the area of
42
43 Kreuzberg which lies within the community district of Kreuzberg-Friedrichshain and represents
44
45 the neighborhood with one of lowest SI in Berlin based on the SI of 2008. The other area chosen
46
47 was Steglitz and Lankwitz which is an area within the community district of Steglitz-Zehlendorf.
48
49 Steglitz-Zehlendorf represents the neighborhood with the highest SI in Berlin in 2008. The net
50
51 household income in Kreuzberg-Friedrichshain in 2006 was € 1,175 per months whereas the net
52
53 household income in Steglitz-Zehlendorf was € 1,850. The areas are roughly of the same size
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (10.4 km² for Kreuzberg and 13.8 km² for Steglitz and Lankwitz) but population density is
5
6 higher in Kreuzberg (14.239 residents/km²) compared to Steglitz and Lankwitz (8.085
7
8 residents/km²; Steglitz is 10.391 residents/km² and Lankwitz is 5.778 residents/km²).
9
10
11
12
13

14 *Availability*

15
16 Within the districts the number of food stores including organic grocery stores and farmers'
17
18 markets were counted. Food stores were identified through systematic investigation of each and
19
20 every street within the established district borders. Farmers' markets were located through
21
22 internet research. Food stores were defined as stores that offer at least one type of fresh vegetable
23
24 and one type of fresh fruit (except lemons or limes). Food stores had to be open at least 5
25
26 days/week for 8 hours/day. Farmers' markets were included if they were open for at least 6
27
28 hours/week. Availability was defined as the number of food stores and farmers' markets per
29
30 10.000 residents.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Variety of fresh fruits and vegetables within food stores*

39
40 Variety of food items was determined through the visual count of different kinds of fresh fruit
41
42 and vegetables available at each store by a trained surveyor to all non-organic food stores during
43
44 the months of May through July 2009. Given that organic food stores are still relatively rare as
45
46 well as usually limited in their fruit and vegetable variety, only non-organic food stores and
47
48 foods were assessed. The following fresh fruit and vegetable items were summarized into larger
49
50 categories and counted as one: berries (strawberries, cranberries, raspberries, blackberries),
51
52 lemon (lemon and limes), melons (watermelons, cantaloupes, honeydew), and cabbage (red
53
54 cabbage, green cabbage, chinese cabbage). To control for seasonal variation and to increase
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 comparability, we collected data concurrently in both districts and completed data collection
5
6 within 12 weeks.
7
8
9

10 11 *Pricing* 12

13
14 For the purpose of price comparison between stores and districts, the most economical price for a
15
16 sample of 12 products was recorded. The 12 products were chosen because of their popularity
17
18 among the German population (DFHV, 2009). Food prices of the following 12 food products
19
20 were measured: apples, bananas, tomatoes, carrots, potatoes, whole wheat bread, fresh milk,
21
22 frozen pizza, chocolate, potato chips, and beer. Since the most economical price for each food
23
24 was often found in bulk quantities we calculated prices for predetermined amounts. Prices for
25
26 fresh fruit and vegetable items were noted per one kilogram (1000 grams). Prices for whole
27
28 wheat bread, chocolate and chips were recorded per 100 grams. Fresh milk prices were recorded
29
30 as price per carton (1 liter), beer prices as the cost per 0.5 liter, and frozen pizza as price for one
31
32 pizza (300 grams). Organic food stores were not entered to record prices or produce variety
33
34 because high quality standards often cause costs to increase which makes sold items
35
36 unaffordable to many people and high prices would result in distorted price averages.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 *Statistical Analysis* 47

48 Analysis of variance was used to examine differences by district (low SI vs. high SI) in the mean
49
50 number of fruits and vegetables and the mean lowest prices of the selected food items available
51
52 in all stores. Using the average caloric content of selected food items (100g pizza = ca. 216kcal,
53
54 100g potato chips = ca. 547 kcal, 100g chocolate = ca. 536 kcal, 100g apples = ca. 49 kcal, 100g
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 bananas = ca. 95 kcal, 100g carrots = ca. 25 kcal), the relationship between energy costs (Euro
5
6 €/1,000 kcal) and energy density (kcal/g) of each food item was calculated.
7
8
9

10 11 **Results**

12
13
14 The low SI district (Kreuzberg) had greater access to supermarkets compared to the district with
15
16 high SI (Steglitz + Lankwitz). Per 10,000 residents, in the low SI district 5.88 food stores
17
18 (including farmer markets and organic food stores; N = 87) were available compared to only 4.42
19
20 food stores in the high SI district (N = 46). More organic food stores and farmers' markets were
21
22 available in the low SI area compared to the high SI area.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Number of types of fruits and vegetables in the low SI district did not differ significantly from
30
31 the number of types of fruits and vegetables in the high SI district (table 1).
32
33
34
35

36 - insert table 1 -
37
38
39

40
41 In the low SI district, prices of the selected food items were assessed in 72 grocery stores
42
43 including 13 supermarkets, 23 discounters, and 36 farmers' markets. In the high SI district only
44
45 45 grocery stores including 18 supermarkets, 18 discounters, and nine farmers' markets were
46
47 found. Including all types of food stores (super markets, discounters and farmers' markets) fruits
48
49 and vegetables did not differ in pricing between the two districts. No differences were found for
50
51 apples, bananas, tomatoes, carrots and beer. Potatoes (F= 9,122, p= 0.003), whole-wheat bread
52
53 (F= 9,527, p = 0.003), fresh milk (F= 56,179, p = 0.000), chocolate (F= 40,489, p = 0.000),
54
55 potato chips (F= 32,655, p = 0.000), and frozen pizza (F= 5,819, p = 0.018) were significantly
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 cheaper in the high SI district compared to the low SI district (table 1). However, when the local
5
6 farmers' markets which were more common in the low SI district were taken out of the analysis,
7
8 the only four remaining items that were less expensive in the high SI district were whole-wheat
9
10 bread (0,16 vs. 0,14; F=20,208, p = 0.000), fresh milk (0,50 vs. 0,48; F= 6,634, p= 0.012), and
11
12 potato chips (0,29 vs. 0,28; F = 6,081, p = 0.016). Without the farmers' markets, bananas were
13
14 cheaper in the low SI district compared to the high SI district (1,18 vs. 1,13; F= 10,589, p =
15
16 0.002).
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 To compare pricing of selected low and high energy dense foods, the mean prices of all grocery
25
26 stores for the following food items were chosen: chocolate, potato chips, pizza, apples, bananas
27
28 and carrots. Figure 1 shows the relationship between energy density (kcal/g) and energy costs
29
30 (Euro€/1,000kcal) of a selection of low and high energy dense foods. It shows that energy costs
31
32 for apples (3,26€/1,000kcal), bananas (4,10€/1,000kcal), and carrots (4,88€/1,000kcal) are higher
33
34 than for pizza (2,16€/1,000kcal), potato chips (0,84€/1,000kcal), and chocolate (0,66€/1,000kcal)
35
36 whereas energy density is higher for pizza (2,16kcal/g), potato chips (5,47kcal/g), and chocolate
37
38 (5,36kcal/g) compared to apples (0,49kcal/g), bananas (0,95kcal/g) and carrots (0,25kcal/g).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 - insert figure 1 -
47

48 **Discussion**

49
50 The variety and prices of the examined food items were similar in the high and low
51
52 socioeconomic districts. More grocery stores per 10.000 residents were found in the low SI area
53
54 compared to the high SI area. The variety of fruits and vegetables did not differ between the
55
56 districts and no differences could be found in terms of fruit and vegetable prices. These findings
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 are in line with several other studies (Smith et al. 2009; Zenk et al. 2009; Cassady et al. 2007) .
5
6 However, other food items such as fresh milk and whole wheat bread tended to be cheaper in the
7
8 high SI district which in part supports the idea that healthy food choices tend to be more
9
10 expensive in more disadvantaged neighbourhoods.
11
12

13
14 Looking at high-fat/energy-dense foods such as pizza, potato chips and chocolate significantly
15
16 higher prices were observed in the low SI neighborhood. A possible explanation for the higher
17
18 prices could be that grocery stores simply sell some of products at a higher price in
19
20 neighbourhoods with a higher demand for these types of foods and products. Since this effect is
21
22 mainly observed for unhealthy food items and not for fruits and vegetables it raises the question
23
24 of the possibility of existing health inequity based on socio-economic standing.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 In general, food pricing in Germany appears to be similar to food pricing in other nations with
32
33 energy dense foods to be the lowest cost dietary options. For people with low SI, the financial
34
35 aspect of foods most likely plays a crucial role in their purchase behaviour.
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Limitations of this study*

42
43 Several limitations of this study need to be mentioned. This was a pragmatic case-study approach
44
45 with the focus on two geographically comparable areas in one particular city. Mainly the
46
47 population density between the two districts differed. This approach does not allow the
48
49 comparison of associations between neighbourhood deprivation and food accessibility for the
50
51 full range of urban and rural settings across the world or even across Germany only.
52
53

54
55 The findings of this study can only be generalized to the study region and spatial inequality
56
57 might exist in rural and small town settings in Germany. In addition, no information on
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 residents' shopping behaviours was obtained and food quality was also not addressed. Other food
5
6 outlets such as convenience stores without fresh fruits and vegetables, restaurants, snack bars
7
8 that might play a role in determining food item pricing were also not examined.
9

10 11 12 13 14 *Possible Implications and future research*

15
16 To our knowledge, this is the first study in Germany looking at neighbourhood food
17
18 environments. The findings showed that the food environment in a socioeconomically
19
20 disadvantaged area was as conducive to buying healthier food choices as in a more advantaged
21
22 area. One possible explanation could be that within the German population social inequality is
23
24 less pronounced than in other countries such as the U.S. and therefore the difference of social
25
26 status in the chosen urban districts was too small to be a factor in the food environment.
27
28

29
30 However, for the districts observed, energy dense foods were cheaper and therefore potentially
31
32 more in demand in low SI districts than nutrient rich foods. Nevertheless, while prices for
33
34 healthy foods appear to be similar in the districts, the purchase of such foods is determined by
35
36 financial resources available to buyers. In particular, food inequity could be questioned since
37
38 people with lower purchasing power have to pay similar prices for healthy foods compared to
39
40 those with higher purchasing power.
41
42
43
44

45
46 Our findings could suggest that inequalities in food intake may have little to do with the food
47
48 environment in Germany but rather the economics of food choice. Social inequality in Germany
49
50 has been linked to obesity and other chronic disease and as Drewnowski and colleagues
51
52 (Drewnowski et al. 2005; Drewnowski 2004) have recently pointed out, more likely factors for
53
54 the lower nutritional quality of diets of low-income households could be the low cost of energy-
55
56 dense foods. Thus, as long as energy dense foods are highly palatable and cheaper we believe it
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 will be difficult to change low-income household's food choices and health inequity through
5
6 pricing remains.
7

8
9 Further research needs to be conducted not only in other geographical areas in Germany and
10 Europe in general but also other mechanisms such as cooking skills and habits in households as
11 well as food costs and its relationship with energy density need to be examined. Currently not
12 enough is known if and how household and food shopping environments affect population intake
13 of fruits and vegetables and its relationship to socioeconomic inequalities in food intake.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Conflict of interest statement**

24 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 References
8
9

10
11 Cassady D, Jetter KM, Culp J (2007) Is price a barrier to eating more fruits and vegetables for
12 low-income families? J Am Diet Assoc 107:1909-1915.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19 Chung C, Myers SL (1999) Do the poor pay more for food? An analysis of grocery store
20 availability and food price disparities. Journal of Consumer Affairs 33: 276-296
21
22
23

24
25
26 Darmon N, Briend A, Drewnowski A (2004) Energy-dense diets are associated with lower diet
27 costs: a community study of French adults. Public Health Nutr 7:21-27
28
29
30

31
32
33 Deutscher Fruchthandelsverband e.V., DFHV (2009). Obst und Gemüse in Deutschland. Bonn
34
35

36
37
38 Drewnowski A (2009) Obesity, diets, and social inequalities. Nutr Rev 67 Suppl 1:S36-S39
39
40

41
42
43 Drewnowski A (2004) Obesity and the food environment: dietary energy density and diet costs.
44 Am J Prev Med 27:154-162
45
46
47

48
49
50 Drewnowski A, Darmon N (2005) Food choices and diet costs: an economic analysis. J Nutr
51 135:900-904
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Drewnowski A, Specter SE (2004) Poverty and obesity: the role of energy density and energy
5 costs. Am J Clin Nutr 79:6-16
6
7
8
9

10
11 Giskes K, Kamphuis CB, van Lenthe FJ, Kremers S, Droomers M, Brug J (2007) A systematic
12 review of associations between environmental factors, energy and fat intakes among adults: is
13 there evidence for environments that encourage obesogenic dietary intakes? Public Health Nutr
14 10:1005-1017
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Giskes K, Turrell G, Patterson C, Newman B (2002) Socio-economic differences in fruit and
25 vegetable consumption among Australian adolescents and adults. Public Health Nutr 5:663-669
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Hendrickson D, Smith C, Eikenberry N (2006) Fruit and vegetable access in four low-income
33 food deserts communities in Minnesota. Agriculture and Human Values 23:371-383
34
35
36
37

38
39 Hernandez-Quevedo C, Jones AM, Lopez-Nicolas A, Rice N (2006) Socioeconomic inequalities
40 in health: a comparative longitudinal analysis using the European Community Household Panel.
41 Soc Sci Med 63:1246-1261
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Hosler AS, Rajulu DT, Fredrick BL, Ronsani AE. (2008). Assessing retail fruit and vegetable
50 availability in urban and rural underserved communities. Preventing Chronic Disease. Public
51 Health Research, Practice, and Policy 5: A123
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Hulshof KF, Brussaard JH, Kruizinga AG, Telman J, Lowik MR (2003) Socio-economic status,
5 dietary intake and 10 y trends: the Dutch National Food Consumption Survey. Eur J Clin Nutr
6
7 57:128-137
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Jetter KM, Cassady DL (2006) The availability and cost of healthier food alternatives. Am J Prev
15
16 Med 30:38-44
17
18
19
20

21 Kamphuis CB, Giskes K, de Bruijn GJ, Wendel-Vos W, Brug J, van Lenthe FJ (2006)
22
23 Environmental determinants of fruit and vegetable consumption among adults: a systematic
24
25 review. Br J Nutr 96:620-635
26
27
28
29
30

31 Kamphuis CB, van Lenthe FJ, Giskes K, Brug J, Mackenbach JP (2007) Perceived
32
33 environmental determinants of physical activity and fruit and vegetable consumption among high
34
35 and low socioeconomic groups in the Netherlands. Health Place 13:493-503
36
37
38
39
40

41 Mackenbach JP, Stirbu I, Roskam AJ, Schaap MM, Menvielle G, Leinsalu M, Kunst AE (2008)
42
43 Socioeconomic inequalities in health in 22 European countries. N Engl J Med 358:2468-2481
44
45
46
47

48 Moore LV, ez Roux AV (2006) Associations of neighborhood characteristics with the location
49
50 and type of food stores. Am J Public Health 96:325-331
51
52
53
54

55 Powell LM, Slater S, Mirtcheva D, Bao Y, Chaloupka FJ (2007) Food store availability and
56
57 neighborhood characteristics in the United States. Prev Med 44:189-195
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Robert Koch-Institut. Gesundheit in Deutschland. Gesundheitsberichterstattung des Bundes.
8
9 2006. Berlin, Robert Koch-Institut

10
11
12
13
14 Senatsverwaltung für Gesundheit UuV. Spezialbericht 2009-1: Sozialstrukturatlas Berlin 2008 -
15
16 Ein Instrument der quantitativen, interregionalen und intertemporalen Sozialraumanalyse und -
17
18 planung. 2009. Berlin, Senatsverwaltung für Gesundheit, Umwelt und Verbraucherschutz

19
20
21
22
23 Smith DM, Cummins S, Taylor M, Dawson J, Marshall D, Sparks L, Anderson AS (2010)
24
25
26 Neighbourhood food environment and area deprivation: spatial accessibility to grocery stores
27
28 selling fresh fruit and vegetables in urban and rural settings. Int J Epidemiol 39:277-284

29
30
31
32
33 Turrell G, Hewitt B, Patterson C, Oldenburg B, Gould T (2002) Socioeconomic differences in
34
35 food purchasing behaviour and suggested implications for diet-related health promotion. J Hum
36
37 Nutr Diet 15:355-364

38
39
40
41
42 van Doorslaer E, Koolman X (2004) Explaining the differences in income-related health
43
44 inequalities across European countries. Health Econ 13:609-628

45
46
47
48
49
50 Winkler E, Turrell G, Patterson C (2006a) Does living in a disadvantaged area mean fewer
51
52 opportunities to purchase fresh fruit and vegetables in the area? Findings from the Brisbane food
53
54 study. Health Place 12:306-319

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Winkler E, Turrell G, Patterson C (2006b) Does living in a disadvantaged area entail limited opportunities to purchase fresh fruit and vegetables in terms of price, availability, and variety? Findings from the Brisbane Food Study. *Health Place* 12:741-748

Zenk SN, Lachance LL, Schulz AJ, Mentz G, Kannan S and Ridella W (2009) Neighborhood retail food environment and fruit and vegetable intake in a multiethnic urban population. *Am J Health Promot* 23:255-264

Zenk SN, Schulz AJ, Israel BA, James SA, Bao S and Wilson ML (2005) Neighborhood racial composition, neighborhood poverty, and the spatial accessibility of supermarkets in metropolitan Detroit. *Am J Public Health* 95:660-667

Table 1. Fruit and vegetable variety and mean pricing in Euro (€) and Standard Error of the Mean (SEM) of foods by neighbourhood socioeconomic standing.

	Low SES (N=72)	High SES (N=45)
Number of fruits (SD)	14.21 (5.94)	16.09 (3.23)
Number of vegetables (SD)	18.75 (6.13)	20.64 (4.14)
Apples (1000g) in € (SEM)	1,44 (,06)	1,49 (,08)
Bananas (1000g) in € (SEM)	1,39 (,05)	1,42 (,07)
Tomatoes (1000g) in € (SEM)	1,93 (,09)	1,59 (,11)
Carrots (1000g) in € (SEM)	1,30 (,04)	1,12 (,06)
Potatoes (1000g) in € (SEM)	0,85 (,05)	0,84 (,04) †
Whole-wheat bread (100g) in € (SEM)	0,19 (,03)	0,14 (,00) †
Fresh milk (1l) in € (SEM)	0,63 (,04)	0,48 (,00) †
Frozen pizza (300g) in € (SEM)	0,83 (,06)	0,71 (,01)*
Chocolate (100g) in € (SEM)	0,51 (,04)	0,36 (,00) †
Potato chips (100g) in € (SEM)	0,46 (,04)	0,30 (,02) †
Beer (0.5l) in € (SEM)	0,41 (,03)	0,34 (,03)
Cigarettes (17 per packet) in € (SEM)	3,39 (,03)	3,28 (,01) †

* $p < 0.05$

† $p < 0.01$




Figure 1. Relationship between energy density (kcal/g) and energy costs (Euro€/1,000kcal) of selected food items